



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,747	12/14/2004	Jochen Dieter Mannhart	ABACP0110US	3101
43076 7590 02/06/2009 MARK D. SARALINO (GENERAL) RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE, NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191				
EXAMINER				
VDAYAKUMAR, KALLAMBELLA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/06/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,747

Applicant(s)

MANNHART, JOCHEN DIETER

Examiner

KALLAMBELLA VIJAYAKUMAR

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/27/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 41, 42, 45-48 and 50-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 60 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 41, 42, 46-48 and 50-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment filed 10/27/2008 has been entered.

Claim-41 was amended. Claims 43, 44 and 49 cancelled. Claim-60 incorporating the limitations of claim-45 was added. Claims 41-42, 45-48 and 50-60 are currently pending with the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
1. Claims 41-42, 46, 50-53, 57 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Truchan et al (US 6,455,166) in view of Feldman (Applied Phys. Lett, 2000, V77(18), PP 2906-2908).

The examiner makes of record that instant claims 41, 50 and 59 recite a broad range of components followed by a series of narrow ranges. For examination purposes, the examiner asserts that the narrow ranges recited in instant claims 41, 50 and 59 are merely exemplary ranges, and thus, the prior art will be applied against the broadest ranges recited in instant claims 41, 50 and 59. Furthermore, the examiner suggests that applicant should delete the narrow ranges from instant claims 41, 50 and 59, and add new dependent claims that recite the narrow ranges recited in instant claims 41, 50 and 59.

Truchan et al et al teach a method of making a superconductor tape containing a biaxially textured polycrystalline face-centered cubic metal article such as Ni and Ni alloy having grain boundaries with misorientation angles greater than about 8 degrees limited to less than about 1%. The metal substrate was first rolled to at least about 95% thickness reduction followed by a first annealing at a temperature less than about 375 C followed by a second rolling operation of not greater than about 6% thickness reduction is provided, followed by a second annealing at a temperature greater than about 400 -1000 C (Abstract; Cl-5, Ln-1; Cl-6, Ln 30; Cl-5, Ln 33-47). This rolling operation meets the limitation of controlling the microstructure by mechanical treatment. The YSZ/CeO₂ buffer layer was deposited by IBAD and YBCO was grown by epitaxy over the substrate (Cl-5, Ln 3-21); and polycrystalline nature of the superconductor would be obvious over the template deposition of the material. Further, In a cube texture, a cube axis, (100), lies parallel to the plane of the sheet and a cube edge, [001], is parallel to the rolling direction, i.e., [100]<001> (Cl-4, Ln 60-65).

The prior art is silent about the shape, structure and ratio of the superconductor grains per claims-41 and 53, and microstructure of the buffer layer per claims 42 and 52.

With regard to claims 41-42 and 52-53, the prior art teaches a superconductor tape and a method of making it wherein its structure, components used to make the tape and the process steps used to make the tape are similar to that taught by the applicants (See Spec., Pg-12, Para-1), and further have the same common utility as the superconducting tape with high J_c, and the presence of the claimed shape and ratio of the microcrystal grains of the metallic substrate in the prior art tape would be obvious, and prima facie obvious over these claims. The creation of grains in the rolling direction/longitudinal direction would be obvious over Feldman that discloses the formation of the grain in Ni-substrate that propagates through the YBCO layer leading to percolation paths (Abstract). The formation of grooves along the edges of the grains in the Ni-substrate would be obvious over the grain structure in the rolling direction. The presence of percolation path along the length of the tape will be obvious because the composition and structure of the tape are similar to that by the applicants.

With regard to claims, 51 and 59, the prior art teaches IBAD deposition of YSZ and/or CeO₂.

With regard to claims 46 and 57, the prior art discloses IBAD deposition of REBACuO (Cl-1, Ln 42-50) over a substrate, and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to deposit ReBaCuO over substrates of Truchan with less than 1% grain boundaries over 8 degrees misorientation as functional equivalent of YBCO with predictable results and reasonable expectation of success and performing of the steps to attain the claimed misorientation of the long grains would be obvious.

With regard to claim-50, the prior art product/tape is similar to that produced by the instant claimed method steps by the applicants, and When the reference teaches a product that appears to be an obvious variant of, the product set forth in a product-by-process claim although produced by a different process, the claim is not patentable. See *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983) And *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also MPEP §2113.

2. Claims 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Truchan et al (US 6,455,166) in view of Feldman (Applied Phys. Lett, 2000, V77(18), PP 2906-2908) and Matsumoto et al (US 6,226,858)

The disclosure by the composition and method of making the tape by Truchan et al in view of Feldman as set forth in rejection-1 under 35 USC 103(a) is herein incorporated.

The prior art is silent about the method of coating per claims 47-48.

In the analogous art, Matsumoto et al teach a method of making a superconductor wire by making a polycrystalline metallic substrate having roll textured surface oriented such that [001] plane is parallel with a rolled plane and <001> axis is parallel with rolled direction, an oxide layer formed on the substrate wherein >90% of <100> plane is inclined at most 10 degrees, and forming a superconductor layer over it (Abstract, Cl-3, Ln 43 – Cl-4, Ln 15). Metallic Substrates included Ni and its alloys (Cl-4, Ln 60-67). Superconductors included REBa₂Cu₃O₇ that was coated by method such as vapor phase and liquid phase techniques (Cl-6, Ln 1-8). The buffer layers included one or more layers of CeO₂, YSZ, SrTiO₃ and MgO (Cl-5, Ln 9-65). The Y123 oxide showed orientation of C-axis perpendicular to the surface of tape in its entire length and dependent upon the underlying oxide layer with improved J_c (Cl-8,

Ex-1, Ln 43-50; Table-1). The thickness of the tape was 150 micron and the thickness of the YSZ was about 0.2 micron and that of Y123 oxide was 0.4 micron deposited by laser ablation and 3 micron deposited by liquid epitaxy (Cl-8, Ln 3; Cl-9, Ln 30-35, 49-65).

With regard to claims 47-48, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to fabricate the YBCO films in the superconductor tape of Truchan et al by either liquid epitaxy or vapor methods over the teachings of Mastsumoto et al with reasonable expectation of success and predictable results with improved J_c , because Truchan et al is interested in attaining improved performance (Cl-1, Ln 33-37; Cl-6, Ln 23-25, 47-50), and is suggestive that a variety of deposition processes may be used to deposit various layers of textured substrate material, and the teachings are in the analogous art.

3. Claims 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Truchan et al (US 6,455,166) in view of Feldman (Applied Phys. Lett, 2000, V77(18), PP 2906-2908) and Jia et al (US 6,383,989).

The disclosure on the method of making the superconducting tape as set forth in rejection-1 under 35 USC 103(a) over Truchan et al in view of Feldman is herein incorporated.

The prior art fails to teach a multilayer superconductor structure per the claims.

In the analogous art, Jia et al teach Improvements in critical current capacity for superconducting film structures are disclosed and include the use of, e.g., multilayer YBCO structures where individual YBCO layers are separated by a layer of an insulating material such as CeO_2 and the like, a layer of a conducting material such as strontium ruthenium oxide and the like or by a second superconducting material such as SmBCO and the like (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the YBCO layers in the superconducting tape of Truchan et al with the superconductor layers of Jia et al as functional equivalent to benefit from improved J_c with reasonable expectation of success, because Truchan is concerned about improving J_c of the superconductor tapes and the teachings are in the analogous art.

4. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Truchan et al (US 6,455,166) in view of Feldman (Applied Phys. Lett, 2000, V77(18), PP 2906-2908) and Thieme et al (US 6,458,223).

The disclosure on the method of making the superconducting tape as set forth in rejection-1 under 35 USC 103(a) over Truchan in view of Feldman is herein incorporated. Truchan et al is silent about the thickness of the Ni/metallic substrate.

In the analogous art Thieme et al teach textured metallic substrates of Cu-Ni alloys for super conductor tapes with a thickness of 51 micron (Abstract, Cl-14, Example-2, Ln 1-2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to substitute the metallic substrate of Truchan et al with that of Thieme et al as functional equivalent with reasonable expectation of success because the teachings are in the analogous art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 45 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim-60 allowed

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record neither teaches nor fairly suggest applicants groove structure, its dimensions and its density per the instant claim.

Response to Arguments

Applicants arguments filed 10/27/2008 have been fully considered and not persuasive to overcome the prior art by Truchan et al. Applicants argue that the claimed invention provides microstructures with oriented long grains with high aspect ratio, but fail to overcome the prima facie obviousness over Truchan et al (Res, Pg-6, Para-4). Applicants argue that the cited prior arts do not teach the instant claimed method of making the microstructure is not persuasive, because the deformation rolling used by Truchan is a mechanical process that meets the instant claimed method step. Further mechanical treatment does not limit to polishing step for creating grooves as argued (Res, Pg-6, Last Para to Pg-7, I-Para). Applicants argue that Lee (US 6,114,287) removes the grooves as undesired is correct, and its teaching of removing the grooves is irrelevant to the rejection cited in the office action, while it clearly

provides evidence for the presence of grooves over substrates treated by the rolling process that are not removed by Truchan.

For the reasons set forth above applicants fail to patentably distinguish their method over the prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KALLAMBELLA VIJAYAKUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-1324. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 07-3.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 5712721358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KMV/
Feb 02, 2009.

/Stanley Silverman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793